DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 072	24	SO 000 819

AUTHOR	Dunham, Richard M.
TITLE	Conference on the Family as a Unit of Study in Social Problems. Volume I. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Inst. of Human Development.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-0160
PUB DATE	Dec 70
CONTRACT	CEC-0-9-190160-2332(010)
NOTE	65p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies, Conference Reports, Developmental Programs, *Family (Sociological Unit), Family Influence, *Family Programs, *Human Services, Individual Development, Interdisciplinary Approach, Literature Reviews, *National Programs, Public Policy, Social Development, Socialization, *Social Planning, Social Problems, Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this conference, held in February, 1969, was to examine the desirability and feasibility of focusing national problems more on the family, with the assumption that more concern with the family in planning and implementing national programs would help to: 1) avoid inadvertent damage to families; and 2) use the properties of the family more effectively in our efforts to cope with social problems. This first volume of the report contains the main digest of the conference discussion, together with additional remarks and perspectives intended to bring out the relevance of the conference for policy formation. The thirty participants were drawn from education and several social sciences, giving a strong interdisciplinary flavor to the proceedings. Task groups considered such topics as: economic structure and industrial practices affecting the family; administration of whole family efforts; adequacy of scientific methods and theory relating to the family; and the political and ideological significance of whole family study. Conclusions and recommendations of the conference are reported in a final chapter. An extensive list of references appears at the end of the report. (JLB)

BR 9-0160
PA 24

ED048072

INSTITUTE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

FINAL REPORT

Contract No. OEC 0-9-190160-2332 (010)

CONFERENCE ON THE FAMILY AS A UNIT OF STUDY IN SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Richard M. Dunham

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Tallahassee

SP 000 819

ED048072

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Contract No. OEC 0-9-190160-2332 (010)

CONFERENCE ON THE FAMILY AS A UNIT OF STUDY IN SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Richard M. Dunham

December, 1970
Volume I of II Volumes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Final Report
Contract No. OEC 0-9-190160-2332 (010)

Conference on the Family as a Unit of Study in Social Problems

Richard M. Dunham
Institute of Human Development
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

December, 1970
Volume I of II Volumes

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in th conduct of the project. Points of view of opinions stated do not therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FOREWORD

One way in which the summarizing of the Family Conference proceedings has been both facinating and challenging is in its rich interdisciplinary content. The several hundred pages of transcripts contain many examples of intense, involved efforts to communicate across disciplinary lines. It has been the task of the writer to pick up and report meaningful contributions offered from various perspectives while having training and experience only in some of them. It follows, therefore, that interpretations of the contributions from some fields may not be as precise or rich in meaning as they might be. At the same time, whatever merit the contribution may have is clearly creditable to the superior interdisciplinary composition of the conference. The valuable perspectives that are reported here were offered by the conferees.

A related point is that the interdisciplinary dialogue often produced lines of reasoning or new perspectives that went beyond the thinking of any single conferee. They were products of geniune dialogue.

Certainly, part of the basic conference design was devoted to insuring that the conferee could participate actively and engage in conjecture without risk of being held responsible for contributions which they might be willing to publish more formally only after much more extensive thought and study. In addition, many conferees were associated with organizations whose views they could not offically represent. To link such a conferee to a given idea might have the effect of implying that he was speaking for his organization, something which was never the case.

Despite their superior qualifications, some of the scientists present considered themselves ill-qualified to recommend policy. Many had no experience with it. Virtually all had had some professional or scientific experience that related fairly directly to the family but some were hesitant to generalize or extend their conclusions to the realm of policy-making.

Volume I has a rather straight forward purpose, to report on the kinds of ideas that occurred in the conference. This writer felt it would be inappropriate to select for reporting only those ideas with which he concurred. Volume I, then, should be read for ideas that may prove to be of value rather than for ideas which have been proven to be of value.

Volume II contains the papers presented at the Conference in edited versions along with certain reference materials. As they influenced the proceedings of the task groups and the present writer's judgement, the papers in Volume II are reflected in the contents of Volume I. They deserve separate reading, however. As a group they offer many useful ideas concerning the theory and methodology of family intervention and the strategic considerations related to them. In particular I would recommend the contrast of approaches of Palmer, Strodtbeck, and Gladwin. Gladwin's second paper should be singled out as an eloquent counterpoint to the main issues of the Conference.

Following the conference, the writer received several letters and notes indicating enthusiasm and an interest in a follow-on conference to delve deeper into matters which activated new thoughts during the task groups. Their expressions of interest may constitute some consensual validation of the basic idea that the family may deserve special attention as an important unit in the study of social problems.

Since the conference, also, some of the recommendations have come to pass or are being actively recommended by other groups as well. That fact provides an additional degree of validation of the mission and structure of the conference and of the selection of the conferees.

Many students and staff members who helped with the conference are credited in Volume II. More recently, others have contributed hours of time and interest. The writer wishes to express his appreciation to these: JoAnn Blackwell, Barbara Butler, Pat Catledge, Leontyne Middleton, Betty Rogers, Linda Rudlinger, Lejeune Silas, and Linda Van Atta.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Forward	i
	Summary	1
I	Background of Conference	3
II	Orientation and Goals of the Conference	16
III	Toward a Working Definition of the Family	23
IV	Conclusions and Recommendations	29
	Reference List	46

SUMMARY

A Conference on the Family as a Unit of Study in Social Problems was held in Tallahassee on February 21-24, 1969, by the Institute of Human Development of the Florida State University. The conference was funded under a contract with the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education. The purpose of the conference, as set out in the original proposal, was to examine the desirability and feasibility of focusing national problems more on the family, under the assumption that a greater concern with the family in the planning and implementation of national programs would aid, 1) in avoiding inadvertent damage to families, and 2) in using the properties of the family more effectively in our efforts to cope with problems of mental illness, crime, and educational retardation.

A select group of thirty conferees representing sociology, psychology, other relevant disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences and education were invited. Observers from several federal agencies were present. The conference began with addresses by R.M. Dunham (conference director), Thomas Gladwin, Oscar Ornati, Frank Palmer, and Fred Strodtbeck. Boyd McCandless served as discussant. A special paper prepared by Paul Wohlford was distributed. The conferees divided into task groups, six at first, then three. The task groups considered economic structure and industrial practices affecting the family, agency review procedures and agency policies vis-a-vis the family, administration of whole family efforts, the adequacy of scientific methods and theory relating to the family, the political and ideological significance of whole family study, and whether policy-making groups and foundations should have any special concern for the family. In the task groups, the conferees also found themselves vigorously discussing the assumption that a family focus is desirable and beneficial.

The Conference provided an exchange of views and information that will be useful to those who are interested in science and technology related to the family. It did not produce a strong consensus that the family should be more central or of greater concern in matters of national policy and in program planning with regard to social problems.

The conferees were not chosen primarily because of their professional commitment to the special importance of the family. While all were capable professionals with some sophistication relating to family studies, only a minority were known primarily for interest in the family. If it is ultimately correct to assume that a solution to social problems should be sought through a concern for the family in national policy and program design, a great many steps, suggested by the conferees should be taken. Among them are the following: Family-centered strategies and intervention prototypes must be devised, field-tested and publicized. Attention must be directed toward agency policies regarding level and duration of funding for family research and intervention projects. Interdisciplinary collaboration must be encouraged. Cost/ Yield comparisons of family-centered and individual-centered intervention designs must be made. Problems of high communication and decision-making loads in family-centered intervention must be solved. Measurement methods and theories applicable in family studies must be strengthened greatly. Parent involvement and incentive techniques must be further developed.

The Final Report of the Family Conference is divided into two volumes. Volume I contains the main digest of the conference discussion, together with additional remarks and perspectives intended to bring out the relevance of the conference for policy formation. Volume II contains the speeches presented at the conference. Each speaker was allowed to edit his manuscript before publication.

CHAPTER I: BACKGROUND OF THE CONFERENCE

Historical Perspective

Landmarks on a mainstream of conscious scientific interest in the family have increased in number strength, and prominence in recent years. Hill (1958) has pointed out that the bulk of the systematic analysis of scientific data on the family has been done since about 1945. There are, of course, notable exceptions to this statement such as Lewis Terman's (1938) studies of marital happiness and Burgess and Cuttrell's (1939) studies predicting marital success; and even earlier there were Colcord's (1920) study of broken homes, Brookes (1922) study of American marriage laws, Patterson's (1924) study of intermarriage, and Richmond and Hall's (1925) studies of child marriages. However, in general it appears that most of the rigorous scientific work on the family has been done recently.

Contributing to the increasing scientific quality of the work are the prevailing zeitgeist of science (Hill, 1955), and the development of specific research tools, including recording devices, statistics, and computers (Hill and Simpson, 1956). There is an increasing acceptance of family study by the public and, therefore, increased availability of normal families for study (Komarovsky and Waller, 1945; Hill, 1958).

Organizational efforts have increasingly encouraged the study of the family (Christensen, 1964). The Ernest R. Groves' Conference on Marriage and the Family which has met annually for over twenty-five years is devoted to an interdisciplinary study of the family.

Early government-sponsored service research programs have also reflected interest in family research. Notable among these were the community programs sponsored by the

Office of Education beginning in 1938 in Toledo, Ohio; Wichita, Kansas; Box Elder County, Utah; and Obion County, Tennessee, which were devoted to helping parents understand their children better and to helping them provide better homes and schools.

The National Council on Family Relations was established in 1938. It sponsors an annual conference and publishes the leading professional journal in the field, Journal of Marriage and the Family.

An important early conference was the National Conference on Family Life which was held in the White House in 1948. This conference was of particular importance because it was considered to be the first attempt at systematizing a framework to cope with problems of family change over time.

Duvall and Hill headed a committee on the Dynamics of Family Interaction to study several aspects of family life. Out of their research came a report, The Dynamics of Family Interaction (Duvall and Hill, 1948).

In 1950, an interdisciplinary workshop in marriage and family research was called by Evelyn Duvall who was Executive Secretary of the National Council on Family Relations. This conference aided in the development of a conceptual framework of what family study should include. Duball (1957) published the first book length treatment of family development.

In psychiatry, pioneering work by Freud (1949) and Ackerman (1938) and the powerfully relevant work by Sullivan (1953) and others in dynamic psychiatry, led to a proliferation of family-centered studies of etiology, diagnosis, and therapy (Ackerman, 1958; GAP, 1966). Other representative studies are cited in sections below.

Sociology has been heavily represented by methods, theory, and personnel in the study of the family. Sociology's increasing investment and productivity culminated in 1964 in the establishment of a section of the American Sociological Association for Family Study.

Family Interaction and Trait Development

Many human characteristics that lend themselves to understanding and controlling our national social problems have been shown to have clear antecedents in the family circle. This is true of characteristics regarded as maladaptive, such as many forms of mental illness or crime, and many consequences of cultural deprivation. It is also true of characteristics which are prized for the individual and are valuable to the community, such as social competence, scholastic aptitude, intelligence, and creativity.

The family may be seen as providing a number of subenvironments which control the emergence of specific individual traits. Examples may be offered as follows:

Anxiety - When studied as a personality trait, anxiety has been shown to be a stable individual characteristic (Spielberger, 1966), which quite possibly originates as a reaction to the emotional climate of the home in childhood (Sullivan, 1953). Mowrer (1939) interprets Freud's views to imply that aversive conditioning of the child by his parents directly produces neurotic anxiety.

Schizophrenia - Regarded by many researchers as occurring in families which possess distinctive patterns of interpersonal relations, schizophrenia has been conceptualized in several ways. The patterns have in common that they provide for the domination of the patient by one or both parents. In addition, there may be conflict associated with dominance striving in the home. The pattern may involve complicated communications and may be covert (Wynne, et.at. 1958; Garmezy, et.al., 1960; Haley, 1962; Lidz, et.al., 1966; Fleck, 1967). Dysfunctional dependency, as well has been found to be associated with parental restriction and over-protection (Dager, 1964).

Aggressiveness - There is also evidence that violent aggressiveness, as a general characteristic, is associated with erratic and violent, punitive parental discipline (Eron, et.al., 1963), and rejection (Dager, 1964). These effects are particularly prominent in lower-lower class families (Myers and Roberts, 1959), which produce a disproportionate amount of violent crime.

Juvenile Delinquency - Inadequate supervision, discipline and cohesiveness in the family contribute to juvenile delinquency (Glueck and Glueck, 1959). Monahan's (1953) analysis of this relationship led him to conclude that the home should be recognized as producing both normal and delinquent behavior patterns. He believes that programs which protect and strengthen family life would be the best type for preventing or correcting juvenile delinquency.

Intellectual Interest and Ability

There is a well-documented association of social class of origin with cognitive teaching style of the parents, rate of language learning, intellectual growth rate and scholastic aptitude (Bayley and Schaefer, 1960; Donoviel, 1966; Freeberg and Payne, 1967). The lower-lower class family provides the child with little language stimulation and with little cognitive information (Bernstein, 1964; Hess and Shipman, 1965). Furthermore, the tone of the parent-child relationship in an instructional situation is physicalistic, and largely aversive. Under these circumstances, the lower-lower class parent is seen to resort to imperatives for control of the child. The physical trappings and environmental process that support the emergence of intellectual interests are weak or missing (Dave, 1963; Wolf, 1964).

The lower-lower class child adapts to the cognitive style of his class. Several of his important qualities follow as derivatives. Thus, he is cognitively undifferentiated with regard to learning strategies. He will show lower scores on intelligence tests, on measures of sophistication in language usage, and on measures of scholastic aptitude (Hess and Shipman, 1965; Bereiter and Engleman, 1966; Hunt, 1961; Bayley, 1965). Furthermore, his is inclined to relate to authority including the teacher, in a physicalistic pattern of conformity, evasion, or resistance. Corrective efforts have borne the necessity of coping with both 1) cognitive deficits, and 2) aversion to the cognitive teaching situation.

Patterns for upper-middle class family interaction contrast with those of the lower-lower class. In a sense they provide for encouragement of the child's exploratory drive by the parents as a happy, natural way to build intelligence and scholastic aptitude (Durkin, 1966). It is conceivable that parents may be taught to provide the atmosphere of encouragement of learning without having to achieve great cognitive growth themselves (Dunham, 1966; Dinkmeyer and Dreikurs, 1963).

Creativity - Another adaptive characteristic which finds nuturance under certain school conditions (Torrance, 1965) and in some homes. The parent or teacher who encourages creative thinking is the one who, 1) lets the child lead somewhat more in the search for a solution to a problem, 2) does not impose a narrow criterion of correctness on solutions, 3) does not reject imaginative, even fanciful solutions, and 4) tolerates apparent tangentiality. Research has indicated that high permissiveness of parents is related to their children's creativity (Getzels and Jackson, 1962).

Motivational Characteristics - Goodman, 1952, 1966; Berkowitz, 1964 and others place strong emphasis on the family as the agent of the culture in early socialization during which values and motives are established in the child. Some of these are important for personal success and for citizenship. The achievement motive is one example of a quality for which strong family interaction correlates can be demonstrated (Rosen and D'Andrade, 1959). Also, like intelligence, it occurs more strongly in the upper-middle class and is deficient in the lower-lower class.

The energy and success with which the study of individual motivation characteristics is being pursued is illustrated in the work of Crowne and Marlowe (1967) who have announced that they will turn to the family circle in their efforts to understand how the motive, response set, or trait they refer to as the approval motive is established. They have found stable individual differences in this quality which includes tendencies to be conforming, cautious, and conventional. As with the need for achievement, it is a quality of high importance to our national culture and its future.

We have chosen to emphasize the emergence of important individual characteristics amidst distinctive family patterns. As Hansen and Hill (1964) have pointed out, highly relevant literature also exists under the general headings of disaster study, problem family study, medical and psychiatric study and the sociological study of crises of dismemberment, accession, and demoralization of the family.

The effects of mother-child or parent-child separation have been reported in a number of studies. Research included studies of infants in institutional situations (Provence and Lipton, 1962); the effects of separation from parents in early childhood (Yarrow, 1964; Bowlby, Ainsworth, Boston, and Rosenbluth, 1961) and long term effects of early childhood separation (Hellman, 1962; MAAS, 1963). The dimensions of early maternal care have been explored and reported by Yarrow (1963, 1961). A critical review of literature concerning maternal deprivation (Casler, 1961) and a review of findings and controversy related to research strategy in maternal deprivation (Ainsworth, 1962) has pointed out problems which must be contended with in further research with the family. Mead (1962), writing for the World Health Organization, has reassessed the effects of maternal care and deprivation from a cultural anthropologist's perspective.

The characteristics that have been cited in this section are intended to be merely representative. Others could have been cited. Collectively, the literature suggests that the family circle is a source of information that will help with the formulation of intervention programs, whether they are addressed to the prevention of social pathology or the support of the development of adaptive characteristics. It also appears that the family could be the prime site of many forms of intervention. More broadly, we may conclude that national policies that tend to strengthen the family's support of the development of adaptive qualities, or which make tactical use of the natural strengths of the family in the effort to combat social pathology, all find support in the literature on family interaction and the related human characteristics.

Methods

The following discussion of methods is divided into two parts. The first touches on service methods and the second describes scientific methods, insofar as they can be differentiated. Some additional relevant efforts in federal programs are cited in sections which follow.

Service methods - The bulk of professional services are still typically provided in the interest of a client, without systematic therapeutic attention to the family context in which the individual pathology arose.

The most fully developed example of whole family services exists in psychiatric therapy which has been readapted to a family context as a method for treatment and investigation (Laquerer et. al., 1964; Kennedy, 1965; Ackerman and Kempston, 1967). The potential of family involvement in therapy is brought out by Greenblatt, (1967). He holds that mental illness originates in families in which sick relationships exist. He advocates early diagnosis and preventive treatment by education.

Analogous developments are occurring in other fields including social case work which is beginning to rely on family interaction as an element in formulating diagnosis and treatment (Voiland, 1962; Briar, 1964; Leader, 1964; Scherz, 1964), and there are similar examples in counseling (Gonberg, 1956; Freeman, 1963).

Scientific methods - Although the capacity to study the family has increased in recent years, due to the development of questionnaires and other increasingly sophisticated instruments for the assessment of characteristics of the family (Jackson, 1956; Rheingold, 1960: Stringer and Pittman, 1961; Roe and Siegelman, 1963; Radin and Glasser, 1965; Bodin, 1967; Moore, 1967), Straus (1964) recognized that family research is usually funded at a level which permits development of standardized instruments. He calls for adequate funding and for persistence in solving methodological problems that delay our dealing directly with substantive problems.

An encouraging trend in family research is the use of direct observation of behavioral interaction in order to avoid the errors characteristic of verbal, rètrospective, and otherwise highly subjective techniques (Vidich, 1956; Bell, 1964; Elbert et. al., 1964; Terrill and Terrill, 1965; Borke, 1967; Honig, et. al., 1968).

There are an increasing, though still small, number of studies which arrange for observation of the whole family under controlled conditions. Some of these go further and utilize truly experimental designs (Cottrell and Foote, 1953; Blood, 1958; Marschak, 1960; Drechsler and Sharpire, 1961; Schulman et. al., 1962; Vanderberg, 1966).

A call for application of principles of experimentation to the study of the family is particularly relevant to the present proposal. As Handel (1965) has pointed out, most truly experimental studies have been done in the context of Psychiatric treatment. Sussman (1964) has described some applicable features of experimental design and Haley (1962) has offered a special interpretation of the meaning of experimentalism in the study of the family.

Fairweather's (1967) challenging call for experimental social innovation comes closest to the mark. He would deal with the problems of the individual by innovative intervention in the social context of the individual. His reasoning should be applicable to both primary and secondary groups. Chilman's (1966) thinking is in harmony with the implications of Fairweather's proposal. If we take seriously the call for experimentalism in the study and treatment of the family, we can foresee rapid advances in the development of an armamentarium of methods to combat social pathology by preventive intervention.

The St. Paul Family-Centered Project (Geismar and Ayres, 1959) involved one hundred and fifty families in a longitudinal descriptive study measuring such variables as family functions, family disorganization, and family movement (Geismar, 1970; 1964; Geismar, LaSorte, and Ayres, 1962; Geismar and LaSorte, 1963). Such longitudinal studies, either descriptive or manipulative, are rare. We conclude that an extremely pertinent research technique has not been exploited. The reasons for this neglect are lack of adequate institutional support, difficulty in collecting such extensive data, and attrition of sample and staff (Christensen, 1964).

Hill (1964) takes a common view. He suggests that the problems involved with longitudinal studies may be insurmountable. He reviews experimental designs that may partially substitute for the truly longitudinal study, such as simulation studies and segmented-panels with controls. His approach is inductive, and he suggests the description of the natural history of the family to provide the taxonomy of its phases and forms. He does not seem to recognize the possibility of an experimental approach in a widespread, family-centered longitudinal interaction directed toward the prevention of social pathology.

In addition to experimentalism and chronic involvement, whole family study is an identifiable special issue. Handel (1965) has spoken for many students of the family in his call for increased attention to study of whole families. He reviewed a number of considerations, one of which, particularly, should be touched on here: data on families as units is not uncommon in the social sciences but is unusual in the behavioral sciences.

Studies of the psychological origins of individual characteristics have often dealt with dyadic interaction data, or have reconstructed the interpersonal relationship by inference from information about the individuals involved. A few studies (Strodtbeck, 1958; Farina and Dunham, 1963) have used data on all possible dyads in a mother-father-offspring interaction. It now appears possible to apply methods of analysis to deal with all components of interaction simultaneously. Without question, whole family study holds rich possibilities.

Related theories - It is possible to recognize a number of existing theories that are readily adaptable to the study of the family, but have not been so utilized. We willcite a representative sample of these possibilities.

The tradition of social learning (Sears, 1951; 1957; Whiting and Child, 1953) carried the strong implication that the social processes of the family are the training grounds for the individuals personality and intellect. The reports often deal with the acquisition and elimination of dramatic behaviors. It is easy to lose a focus on the learning process itself, and to revert to a consideration of what is being learned. See, for example, Honig, Tannenbaum, and Caldwell, 1968.

Social learning research has not turned sufficient attention to the learning process as it actually occurs in the family. Bandura and Walters (1963) offer a criticism of learning research in general. They state that learning theory suffers from having been developed in the study of one-organism situations. They feel that new principles will be added to the theory as it is tested in social contexts.

Manifestly, one might add that social learning theory must ultimately describe learning as it occurs in the family and as it influences socialization. An example of a project which observes learning in a family setting is the Infant Language Development Project, where preverbal verbalizations and the factors influencing them are investigated in infants under one year of age (Webster, 1968).

It might also be pointed out that no institution has so great a capacity to deliver socializing experiences to a child (or adult) as the family. Both of the qualities and the quantity of the family-delivered experiences can be influenced by agency programs, but agency programs are not likely to be able to afford to match the family's delivery capacity on a nationwide basis.

The tradition of behavioral ecology of Barker and Wright and their colleagues (1955; 1965), and the tradition of small group research in communication and decision-making from social psychology (Bowdia, 1966), are additional examples of areas of study which have developed and used precise methodology that may be further adapted to work with families

In conclusion, it should be observed that the nation's direct investment in Research and Development programs dealing with families is not large compared to investments in other problem areas which have come to take a focal position in national policy. If national policy does make greater investment in family-centered programs possible, it seems quite possible that many present methodological problems will be recognized as having been merely the inevitable consequences of research efforts which were severely under-supported.

Values - One cannot consider strongly family-centered national programs without raising questions of values (Christansen, 1964). Will we clumsily impose conformity to obsolescent values (Goertzl and Goertzl, 1962)? Will scientific, objectivity and validity be sacrificed as guiding standards? The concern with values will be inescapable and must be frankly represented in our efforts. We will face such problems in the form of legal, ethical, and political issues as we seek to work out ways of avoiding intrusiveness and unnecessary coersion while offering assistance to the family which needs it in its effort to rear a child.

Impact of Current Programs

At present it seems possible to defend an assertion that many service activities, ignore, compete with, or even detract from the adaptive functions of the family. For example, formal education programs are offered almost exclusively to individuals without regard to untreated family members and without effective concerns for any disruptive consequences that may occur. Some programs, ADC is an example (Burgess, 1964), have been construed to be destructive of the family. ADC rules have sometimes been said to perpetuate the hopeless dependency of its beneficiaries.

Taking a positive point of view, the possible advantages of a family-centered effort has long been recognized (Samenfink and Hranzler, 1960). Although it is rare to find a truly family-centered program, whether passive and descriptive or experimental, that offers meaningful parent involvement over a sufficient period of time, some recent trends in federal agencies attest to the emergence of a more aggressive exploration of the efficacy of family-centered programs.

For example, in the directive issued by Harold C. Howe II, Commissioner of Education for all compensatory education projects under the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on August 12, 1963. He directed all chiefs of state educational agencies to make appropriate organizational arrangements for community and parent involvement in all programs. He recommended the establishment of Local Advisory Committees, 50% of whose membership consisted of parents of disadvantaged children. A directive such as this recognizes that necessity of parental involvement and education for the long range solution of existing social problems. It also suggests that there is a growing recognition of the desire of people being served to take part in the policy-making of their educational institutions.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has moved steadily towards increasing an emphasis on the family-centered approach. The parent education/involvement features of Headstart are frequently cited in this regard.

Project Know How (PKH), a comprehensive and experimental intervention in familial poverty, conducted at the Florida State University, was funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity in March, 1967. To date no project has been reported which approaches PKH in the duration, intensity, and extensity of whole family involvement. The Project deals with the cognitive development of the child beginning with ages 1-2 and with both parents in their respective roles of breadwinner and head of household for the father, and homemaker for the mother. Furthermore, it deals with the interaction of the family members in their respective roles.

Shortly thereafter, in May 1967, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced a Parent-and-Child Center (PCC) Program to be carried out in cooperation with HEW, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Housing and Urban

Development. PCC's have as their primary objective delivering services to the entire family of children under 3 years of age. A number of these programs have been proposed and funded, and there is a demand for them in many communities. Although the entire family is expected to be served in these programs, in many cases it is not clear that a strong program involving the fathers of the children will be implemented.

The Federal Interagency Requirements for Day Care has recently approved by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor present guidelines for the establishment of Day Care Centers. They state that parents must be able to work with and observe the child, assist in the decision-making and policy formulation of the facility. The requirements provide only limited services for parents, but do begin an effort to increase parent involvement.

Both the PCC and the Federal Interagency Requirements raise the hope of more sophisticated inter-agency cooperation in the development of family-centered programs.

Further evidence of the movement toward family-centered programs is seen in the State Welfare Plan Requirements for Service Programs to Children and Families, according to Title IV, Parts A and B of the Social Security Act. Aside from the child-directed services, the guidelines provide for improvement of family living through assisting parents to overcome homemaking and housing problems, attempting to reunite families, assisting in money management and consumer education, child rearing and other problems of family living.

CHAPTER II: ORIENTATION AND GOALS OF THE CONFERENCE

The purpose of this chapter is to supplement the background information provided in Chapter One with information on the immediate orientation or set suggested to the conferees on their arrival. That set was conveyed primarily in two statements made to the conferees as a group. The first was my opening statement which is reported below and which is also included in the foreword of Volume II of the present report. The second was my charge to the task groups composed following the presentation of addresses published in Volume II.

My opening remarks were as follows.

"The present conference is sponsored by the Bureau of Research, Office of Education. It occurs here because it was felt that the kind of whole-family intervention effort that we have in Project Know How made our campus a suitable location. The original formulation of the conference was achieved in an in-house position paper by David Bushnell, who is Chief of the Adult Education Section of the Bureau of Research.

"Behind the planning of this conference lies what I take to be a very general consensus: that it is time to seriously consider using whole-family intervention approaches as basic to the formulation of policies and programs designed to eliminate our major national social problems. The elements are now at hand to make a period of family-centered social planning successful. The elements are at hand in the same sense, perhaps, that the conceptual and methodological elements were at hand before the Manhattan Project was carried out. The fact that one can see the possibility of such planning, however, does not mean that there aren't a great many steps to be taken in actually developing the necessary technology, facilities, and so on.

"The objective of the conference, then, will be to foster an anticipated historical trend, one which I think will occur in any case, but may occur better and sooner by virtue of what we accomplish here. We hope to contribute to the initiation of a wave of review of scientific methodology and theory, of agency programs and policies with regard to the family.

"I want to emphasize that it is not our goal to have a deep examination of some limited range of issues, and to fail to cover in sufficient breadth the possibilities for actual action by other groups which should follow as a consequence of this meeting. I am calling for production of as great a range of views, range of concrete suggestions, as possible, even, if necessary, at the expense of depth of consideration.

"This means, then, that our meeting will support an advocacy, more, perhaps, than an evaluation of feasibility, There are agency personnel, members of the scientific community, committees of the Congress in need now of concrete suggestions on directions in which to move; and able and, necessarily in their roles, willing to do the critical thinking that would follow on the receipt of any one recommendation. So that, in the interest of productivity, some tolerance of the loose ends, the poorly worked out consequences of some recommendations, is acceptable.

"We are very much in the forefront of a change that is occurring, crystalizing very rapidly in the zeitgeist, a change toward emphasis on the family in our programs. It is not only the common sense of the professional community at large, as I have seen it, but it is consistent with the common sense of the political leadership, both Democratic and Republican. It follows that one of the unique things about what we are going to try to accomplish here is that it is one of the few kinds of exercises that would have as much support from diverse elements in the community as this one will have. We can expect to have the support of the old and the young, the unpoliticized and the activist, of blacks and whites, of rural and urban people, of the community at large and the educated elements of the community.

Such a program, if it is picked up by political leadership, can serve to reduce what has been referred to as the divisiveness that exists in the country as a whole. There are things that come to mind that have occurred in the Federal scene that support this view. The parent-and-child center movement of the OEO and OCD is certainly one. (To mention only one other,) I will cite the work of Dr. Bobbitt, and the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children and Youth, of which he has been Executive Secretary. He sent me the task force papers and recommendations of the Joint Commission have reached overall conclusions that is highly consistent with what we are trying to do here. It is expected, I think, that some of the details that come out of this conference will serve to support the recommendations of the Joint Commission in very practical ways. Dr. Bobbitt reports that the Joint Commission is expected to recommend to the President the establishment of a high level family-and-child council. Such a council might work with the budget bureau for program planning and program criteria development. The function here will be an advocacy. The Commission may also recommend that local family-and-child councils be established, to enter into planning with local agencies, with the end in view of gaining organizational structures and technology better suited to the support of the family and the development of the children. Their recommendation stems from the conclusion that problems of mental health must be handled preventively because there is not the possibility of mustering sufficient resources to handle them by correction. It is concluded that the support must be directed to the developmental process and its context in the family. I suppose an engineer might say that the Commission may propose that we work out effective quality control procedures with regard to the developmental process procedures that would operate for the most part through the family.

"Such a viewpoint is based on the observation that the literature of the social and psychological study of the development of personal characteristics increasingly shows specific family processes to the major determinants. This is true of those characteristics, such as ignorance, occupational incompetence, mental retardation, crime and delinquency, and mental illness, which constitute the personal aspect of our most serious national problems. It is also true of those qualities, such as intelligence, creativity, and good citizenship, which are our major national assets. Whether we focus on the developmental deficiencies and distortions of individuals or on their best adaptive capacities, those most satisfying to the individual or useful to the community, we find that the central contribution of the structure of the family, as judged by the scientific literature, is to the greatest extent, neglected in our national planning."

Six task groups were initally established to achieve a division of labor in covering a total agenda which was presented to the whole conference and was composed of charges to the six task groups. The items listed for each task group were placed only in an approximate sense. In fact, discussions of many of the items occurred in more than one task group. The elaborateness of some of the charges reflect the depth of the writer's experience in these areas.

The task group and their charges were as follows:

Task Group I: Economic Structure and Industrial Practices Affecting The Family

Recommendations for experimental and service forms of subsidizing low income families with funds through housing and services.

Recommendations of methods of evaluating subsidization techniques from an economic point of view.

Recommendations of effects of classification policy and other personnel practices on income.

Recommendations concerning the possibility of revision of methods of determining the values of work.

Recommendations concerning the development of simplified and standardized cost-effectiveness procedures for use by whole-family projects.

Task Group II: Agency Review Procedures and Agency Policies Vis-a-Vis the Family

Recommendations concerning institutionalization of policy review relating to the family.

Recommendations for the allocation of resources to support whole-family approaches on an ongoing basis.

Recommendations for the institutionalization of the inter-agency support of whole-family efforts both at the local, state, and national level.

Recommendations for the institutionalization of of program review procedures to minimize the likelihood of inadvertent damage to families.

Recommendations for the development of whole-family experimental intervention at an appropriate scale of funding and replications.

Recommendations concerning the establishment and review of cost standards for the whole-family efforts.

Recommendations for incentive systems and ethical codes sufficient to maintain cooperative participation by families in research for substantial numbers of years.

Recommendations concerning the establishment of review and dissemintation process concerning the technology of family study and service.

Task Group III: Local Administration of Whole-Family Efforts (Local - State - Regional Points of Focus)

Recommendations for management studies to identify organizational structure and administrative patterns for whole-family programs.

Recommendations for studies of communication patterns and information loads in local whole-family projects.

Recommendations concerning standards for national, state, and local sharing of funds and control.

Recommendations concerning standards for joint agency monitoring of local projects.

Recommendations of institutionalization of local inter-agency relationship in support of whole-family projects (e.g.: Uniform personnel standards).

Recommendations for setting up universal whole-family grant proposal procedures and forms.

Recommendations concerning identification of the key areas of technological inadequacy or conceptual inadequacy.

Recommendations for study of stress levels including disease in staff personnel and participating family in whole-family projects.

Recommendations concerning development of comprehensive list of services with cost of support planning with whole families.

Recommendations for development of comprehensive job classification document for whole-family project personnel.

Task Group IV: Effective Description of the Whole Family: Scientific Theory and Method

Recommendations for the construction of a set of modes of quantifications of whole-family data.

Recommendations for development of methods that are fully acceptable to families, have good face validity and are appealing on other grounds to the families.

Recommendations concerning universalized evaluation elements for family research and service efforts.

Recommendations concerning the development of an institutional structure to work against paternalism, parochialism, ethnocentrism, etc., and to cultivate the development of expanded value systems.

Recommendations of study of success and failure in interdisciplinary support of whole-family efforts.

Task Group V: Political and Ideological Significance of Whole-Family Study

Recommendations for putting the extant values of whole-family orientation in a form the political leaders can use.

Recommendations of procedures of identification of values which may be interpreted as favoring whole-family approaches, and values which may be offered to broaden the basis of support of family approach.

Task Group VI: The Role of Policy-Making Groups: Foundations and Advisory Groups

Recommendations for building procedures or structures into foundation and advisory boards for keeping the family in view of their deliberation.

Recommendations for getting the advisory boards to return to the family periodically as an imperative matter of concern.

A shift from six task groups to three occurred on the last morning of the conference and was influenced by the interests of the conferees and by a tendency for discussions in the original six groups to center increasingly on the final three topics which were as follows:

Task Group A: Administrative and Policy
Task Group B: Methods and Theory
Task Group C: Substantive Concerns.

CHAPTER III: TOWARD A WORKING DEFINITION OF THE FAMILY

During the conference there were frequent expressions of an interest in specifying the definition of the family under which we should operate. This concern stemmed from an illusion that the conference was devoted to some special problem areas, such as early childhood intervention, families of black Americans, or families with young children. The papers offered by speakers and examples used in discussion did, in fact, run to these and related topics of current widespread interest, so that the illusion was difficult to avoid. However, we were frequently drawn back to a concern for the universal family; that is, the family in all of its forms, by university and agency personnel who cited the problems of families generally, including problems characteristic of the middle class, problems occurring with older children, problems existing in white American families and so on. Nor did the structuring of the mission of the conference imply such a narrow focus.

Most discussions of the family proceed with limited attention to the problem of definition of the term "family," either in theoretical or operational form. It is unwise to take it for granted that everyone understands our report. We may not be talking about the same thing. There is a tendency in discussion of national family policy and related scientific areas to be concerned primarily with the nuclear family, that is man, woman and child or children. It is, of course, a convenient stereotype. It does match the central tendency of family units in virtually all societies. It does permit discussion of the great range of problems and properties which inhere in family life. It is possible to extend a discussion centering on such a stereotype to special family definitions with relative efficiency as the need arises. One need change only some of the elements of a description of the universal nuclear family to support a special discussion of single parent families, as an example.

On the other hand, the definition of the family as a nuclear family is culture bond and may, at time, be dangerously ethnocentric even within our own society. Its use may serve to retard acculturation or variation in family structure for experimental purposes. A definition of the nuclear family as it is presently most commonly used is insufficiently developed to support scientific advance and policy development at the level of complexity needed to serve our national purposes.

One might make an argument that agencies define families differently, each in terms of the needs to which the agency is addressed and the methods in which the agency deals. No one, of course, would defend such a definition as technologically or theoretically adequate.

Census and some other data have been collected in terms of households. The household, however, is not a unit that lends itself to sensitive theoretical analyses. Child development, life style, family interaction, and family role structure are not captured in the term.

It may be recognized that the literature in the social and behavioral sciences, concerning the family, in itself, offers an extended definition of the family in its various forms and conditions and in its range of functions and properties. In the absence of an adequate theoretical structure, however, the relevant literature cannot reliably serve as a definition.

Some attempts to define the family deal in the presumed functions of the family, an approach which has generated some disagreement. They have also proceeded in disappointing theoretical terms and have little benefit from empirical data.

A definition is needed with sufficient theoretical power to tie together major relevant theories of various social sciences and with an adequate operationalization to support extensive quantitative data collection and the search for quantitative relationships that are both of practical and theoretical value.

Perhaps the most powerful definition of the family yet achieved has been constructed in developmental terms. Families are formed and progress through fairly characteristic phases as their membership changes age and character, and as the required behaviors change in base rates. There are crucial points over the life cycle of a marriage at which changes typically occur in satisfaction, distribution of power, sexual behavior, and communication. The developmental approach to defining the family brings theoretical order to a wide range of observations and has inspired a great deal of research.

It may be dangerous to fix the definition of the family. If a given definition is rapidly held it becomes a stereotype perhaps, even a stereotype ideal and may become the object of self-fulfilling prophesy.

For this reason a definition is offered in terms of the most salient functions of the family. It is one which, it would seem, least invites stereotyping, a former function. It is a minimum sufficient definition.

A careful review of the transcript of the conference does not reveal points at which the discussion is incompatible with the definition.

As it is proposed here, the definition of the family that is must useful in regard to social problems and opportunities includes three characteristics: A FAMILY IS THAT IMMEDIATE SOCIAL CONTEXT (PRIMARY GROUP) WHICH: 1) ACCEPTS SUBSTANTIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE SOCIALIZATION OF A CHILD 2) CONTRIBUTES TO THE SOCIALIZATION OF PARTICIPATING ADULTS, ESPECIALLY WITH REGARD TO SOCIAL MATURITY, CITIZENSHIP, AND OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE; AND 3) PROVIDES THE IMMEDIATE ECONOMIC SUPPORT FOR THESE SOCIALIZATION FUNCTIONS.

A definition in terms of socialization as offerred above does not neglect physical development and health nor cognitive development and scholastic aptitude. They become required conditions for or products of satisfactory socialization.

One task group within the conference addressed itself to economic and industrial issues affecting the family. The transcript of their discussion contains several pages of difficult exchange in which the economists pressed for definitions in relatively standard, objective terms that could be readily quantified and monitored on a national basis. "What are the little boxes that we can shuffle around?" That is, what are the standard empirical indices of family condition or function that we can relate to the "little boxes" that are established in use in economics. A family sociologist present, a researcher of well-earned stature, pointed out that no satisfactory answer was possible at this point in the history of the study of the family.

Quantitative indices that relate to a theoretical definition of the family will lend themselves to quantitative analysis of their relationship to the quantitative terms within Keynesian economics.

The economic functions supporting socialization must also be described in detail. At first, accounting might include quantitative information on a) number, amounts, and types of incomes; b) working hours and leisure time use, or more broadly, time use distributions; and c) number of adults in the family, including categorizations by time use, age, and sex patterning.

One of the net effects of an economic analysis of the intra-familial factors supporting socialization would be to provide one dimension of an assessment of the delivery capacity of the family as described elsewhere in this report. The delivery capacity is the capacity of the family to deliver to the child those human encounters, interpersonal transactions, or other learning trials that as an aggregate, transform by some function into the various manifestations of socialization; i.e., motor maturity, mental maturity, social maturity, etc.

A definition of the family may need to include the extended family when it is financially interdependent but does not fall within a single household. Some extended consanguineal families remain substancially interdependent from a financial point of view. There is evidence that the urgan ghettos include responsible and not widely recognized structures which may be termed "extended conjugal families." The entended conjugal family shares financial support of children among several combinations of spouses. Income is produced by males or females through public work or public support programs and distributed according to need, primarily to the wives, former wives, concubines, mothers, and grandmothers who have the most direct responsibility for child care, and maintenance of households. A description of the extended conjugal family exists at all class levels when financial support and personal attention is redistributed between divorced or separated individuals, often into new nuclear families, for the support of children of the earlier relationship.

Under the type of definition that is being suggested here, it will be necessary to develop two versions or provinces for economics and each of the other social sciences to accommodate the phenomena associated with the term "family." Just as the physical sciences must operate within and without the atom, so must the social sciences develop theory and methods within and without the family.

It should be noticed that the above description does not commit us to any phenotype or stereotype of the family. It may or may not include the consanguineal or conjugal family, families of a given racial or cultural background, single parent or matriarchal family, extended or nuclear families. It will include some institutional settings and local agencies that assume primary responsibilities for the socialization of children. It will subsume communal and other families, whether arising of their own accord or contrived for ideological or scientific purposes.

It is of fundamental importance that the voluntary participation of the adults involved is not infringed by any implications of this definition. Certainly there are legal issues which go beyond the competence of this conference and the writer of this report. They are worthy of special consideration in their own right and as they relate to the matters discussed here. From an ethical point of view, however, personal freedom is of basic importance and is not necessarily jeopardized.

It is important not only with regard to the question of personal freedom but also with regard to the emergence of new family forms, processes, and properties, that under the present definition, it may be said that the family is left free to define itself. Or, to be more precise, the family is left free to constitute itself according to any **stereotype** of phenotype it wishes.

It might appear that some element of chronicity or stability must be present to satisfy some of the implication of the term "family." It is a matter that is open to debate, however, perhaps the best short-run strategy will be to treat the duration of the effective existence of a particular "family" as a dimension of description along which data is to be gathered. After treating chronicity as a dependent variable for a doubtful period of time, we may be better able to judge whether there are discontinuities which should be used in defining the family or its subtypes.

CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The value of a family-centered approach was actively debated during the conference. There was an atmosphere of considerable involvement. It was not so much that there were proponents and opponents. Those who spoke most actively against it took pains at points to state the conditions under which they could support its application and even sought ways to explore and foster the concept. Similarly those who were most devoted to a family-centered approach were actively critical of it as well. A great many observations and opinions were offered in favor of this approach, however, and some obstacles were identified, as well.

A "laundry list" of things to be done is not presented in the discussion that follows. A few suggestions for highly specific actions by particular agencies were offered by conferees, individually or in task groups. These are conveyed. The conclusions and recommendations consist most importantly, however, of a sufficient discussion of goals consistent with an increased concern for the potential significance of the family, of the primary context of socialization, whatever its form, for the study of social problems to permit a decision to be made of whether to take additional exploratory steps. It is the writer's interpretation that enough weight of reason exists to justify some systematic steps by which the merits of a family-centered approach to social problems may be more thoroughly determined.

Science Policy

Several provocative discussions occurred with regard to science policy. Social and behavioral scientists were said to be oriented toward the fulfillment of their immediate professional goals, to the neglect of the interest of the community at large. It was said that their products were designed for consumption within their own scientific circles and not primarily for benefit of the public. Social scientists were characterized as vested interests, holding positions within the social structure and the culture which predisposed them to operate in the interest of the more powerful segments of the community. It was felt that there is increasing public suspicion that the social scientist will not be able to deliver what he promises and will, in fact, deliver unanticipated and undesirable effects. There was a recognition that social science may be in danger of being insensitive and even exploitative. The point was made with vigor by a notably statesman like social scientist who stated, "You are intellectualizing to the point that you accept unacceptable conditions among your clients. Tacitly you even assume they are unchangeable. Intervention is, therefore, exploitation. The professional is immune to feeling; the only people who are being hurt, are people who are poor and weak, or, being black, identify with the poor and weak. You should be outraged; you should all be using four letter words and screaming, but you accept it as given. It is a conspiracy of scientists."

The sentiment was expressed by agency personnel, however, that the need for application of social science to domestic problems is desperate. To this end, it was suggested that a new institutional form was required which would develop the link between the university and its mission with the public need as perceived at all governmental levels and in all demographic segments of the community.

Also, a conferee suggested the possibility of re-engineering research review panels to provide broader representation including the lay community. There were isolated objections to lay participation. However, the dominant sentiment of scientists present seemed to be that more contact, dialogue, and balanced negotiation was needed between the social scientist and the lay public. There was a call for restructuring scientific research to such a degree that human subjects would cease to be merely objects of study or, at best, clients, and would become collaborators and constituants who both support and control science.

Very often the question of lay-participation in agency governance takes the form of parent involvement in programs at the local level. If the parent involvement succeeds in delivering autonomy and power in some increased degree to the parent, it was expected that the effect on self-esteem and social competence will be very favorable and that they in turn would have a strong and favorable effect on parenting.

The dearth of family-centered studies is not unrelated to the concerns expressed above. The family is very central in the socialization process that produces the social problems against which social science is accomplishing so little, and may deserve to be intensively studied, especially in research which is truly experimental in the sense that it (1) actually attempts to change something to a beneficial end and (2) is based on a relatively firm and explicit rationale.

Several conferees observed that much that is done is family-related though not family-centered, and that nothing comparable to economic indicators for keeping tract of the condition of the family has been operationalized. Nor is there a permenantly established review of family-related studies. And, even though there have been reports of research and demonstration efforts which were said to contribute to family failure, there are still no requirements for uniform monitoring standards with regard to effects on the cohesiveness and intactness of families collaborating in federally funded research.

One discussion of research interventions with the whole family produced a distinction between integrative and disintegrative efforts. According to this distinction an integrative approach provides a service to the family, treats relationships between its members and treats individual members only in conjuncture with other members. Presumably disintegrative research is merely investigative and deals with the individual member to the exclusion of other members. The sentiment was that federal research funding should encourage the integrative. The distinction was challenged, as was the concept of the whole family, as being unable to be operationalized, but the belief was asserted that molar concepts such as health, and integrative family research could find meaning without falling victim to reductionism. Systems analysis, survey and audit methods, mathematical and computer models, and review procedures were mentioned as able to deal with the complexity of a molar concept.

There was a discussion of the role of the social scientist in policy formation. It was felt that the practicing research scientist should influence policymaking through the production of data. Policy relevant research was discussed in one task group. Examples that were agreed upon included the need to determine what factors or events control the emergence of an attachment between mother and child in the immediate post-natal attachment period, the conditions under which mother surrogates can function successfully, studies of child development as it is influenced by the composition or functions of the family. There were many others, of course. The question is raised of whether agencies possess a mechanism for identifying priority policy-related issues vis-a-vis the family.

It was apparent from the discussion in three task groups that personnel manpower problems are serious factors limiting the growth of family-centered and other complicated social science efforts. It was observed that social scientists often operate as single investigators with some support staff, and that they are often not prepared by experience or training for operations on a large scale. In one year alone a federal agency closed major programmatic grants, exceeding a quarter million dollars per year at each of three different universities, which are reported to operate at the highest level of quality nationally. In all three cases they were unable to attract and coordinate behavioral and social scientists in sufficient numbers. There was said to be a lack of suitably trained and experienced technicians and specialized management personnel, also. In view of this kind of problem, among others, the readiness of social science to mount whole family projects would seem to be in doubt.

On the other hand, projects dealing with the total family have proven to be a serious challenge to the funding agencies as well. One agency was said to have concentrated on the child because it had judged that it would be too complex to deal with the family.

Interesting contrasts were offered between physical and social research and development (R & D) efforts. As we have noted, if a social R & D program does not produce early results, it is apt to lose its funding. By contrast very high early failure rates are expected in physical R & D programs in the early stages, before component reliabilities are built up. Expectations concerning cost are also very different.

Many suggestions were made for increasing the feasibility of family research. Data gathering instrumentation and data reduction equipment should be adapted and made available to help to lighten the heavy load of data processing in family research. It is an under-instrumented field of study. Family research, furthermore, to be realistic, demands well-trained teams of technicians and researchers from several disciplines. Its cost/effectiveness may seem low. It may not be, however, when it is compared with research on problems of equal complexity or with the cost of accomplishing the same purposes with subjects taken as individuals rather than in a family context.

While a major family-centered experimental intervention may have a primary goal, such as influencing the production of a child with good scholastic aptitude, there are in fact multiple goals of importance. Research and service with the whole family makes available a universe of phenomena. For this reason, on virtually any budget, choices of operating goals will be necessary even after the hard choices are made the program will be left with multiple goals and a serious challenge concerning internal coordination.

The requirement for specialized personnel in teams, the requirement for high and stable levels of funding and the requirement for instrumentation and data processing equipment suggests that establishment of large laboraties simultaneously gathering a range of data on families should be considered.

Services and Family Policy

Perhaps the most challenging concept to emerge during the discussion of the family-centered approach to the delivery of services was that they are so fragmented and after-the-fact as to lose any suggestion of fulfilling their promise for serving as vehicles for primary prevention. The family policy of a European industrial nation was used as an example. It was characterized as a set of specific programs each related to a specific apparent deficit or need. Each program is separately administered, although, perhaps, with greater success in coordinating among them than we experience in the United States.

American family policy is not made explicit but may be thought of as existing in bits and pieces. It takes both a pro-family and an anti-family form. The anti-family form is manifested in a lack of due concern of the strength and effectiveness of the family in the design and operation of line service programs and in the insistence on evolving surrogate functions to the exclusion of improving the capacity of the family to function for itself. A conferee observed that we set up programs and expect families to adapt to them, rather than adapt the programs to the characteristics of the families. In doing so we devalue the parent in the eyes of the child, risk damage to families, and fail to enlist the family with its natural strengths in our efforts. Public education, in particular, was even said to be based historically on distrust of the family.

The pro-family policy is centered largely in the religious community, but finds expression among agency personnel on occasion. It takes the form of sentiment more often than of program. An example is a remark by a senior and highly sophisticated agency official attending the conference: "The total family is the working unit on which to concentrate if you're interested in upgrading the child. This concept has to prevail if you're going to do anything."

Several specific kinds of programs which might be conceived and implemented as family-centered programs were suggested. By far the strongest consensus favored some form of income maintenance. Full employment, negative income tax, family allowances, guaranteed annual income, economic development (especially in the south), and a high economic growth rate for the nation were also mentioned as methods of protecting families against excessive economic pressures.

Any form of income maintenance was expected to affect economic indicators, particularly in depressed areas. There would be, in turn, effects on, social indicators if they existed, including measures of the amount and quality of family interaction. There also was predicted a consequent change in socialization and in self-esteem and social competence. Pending the results of current experiments it was considered an open question whether income maintenance techniques would in fact tend to damage personal growth of motivational qualities.

Full coordination of federal social security provisions, unemployment insurance, disability insurance and minimum wage laws was thought to be needed. Welfare policies were said to require evaluation, to increase levels of support, to make it convenient to accept employment with no fear of difficulty in reestablishing eligibility for welfare if necessary in the future, and to make level of support uniform throughout the nation in order not to encourage migration to metropolitan areas by virtue of their higher welfare support levels.

After the strong consensus concerning the importance of economic stability to the family, there was also a consensus that the family would require certain supports in the process of improving itself. Social services and educational opportunities for family members at all ages were prominently mentioned. One particularly interesting service that was discussed was a Parent-Effectiveness Training Center. The center was conceived as a way to help parents learn to cope more effectively with aspects of child rearing with which they were unfamiliar or uneasy. Presumably, it would function preventively in conjunction with mental health and educational programs. Closely related to this idea was one that called for the development of predictive equations suitable for the support of a counseling process with men and women who might wish to take the probabilities account as a part of the family planning and child nurturance processes. Another related idea called for development of classifications of families together with standard prescriptions for dealing with the characteristic problems of each. There prescriptions would be revised periodically as new research information became available. A pattern of family agents and experimental stations analogous to agricultural agents and experimental stations was suggested also.

Economic and Social Indicators

One of the richest and most provocative exchanges within the conference occurred within a task group in which economists and a social scientist had an extensive exchange. Accordingly, it is treated here in a separate section.

The exchange centered on the use of the Keynesian revolution in economics as a possible model for the operation of social science in general with respect to public policy.

Prior to the Great Depression, economics influenced government policy very little. However, increasingly during the depression and the Second World War there were opportunities for the economist to make recommendations which were implemented. It is a great tribute to economists that they built into the implementation system a series of economic indicators. That action made possible an increasingly accurate and complete set of predictions of the effects of the implementation of their recommendations.

The economists observed that there is now established for the economic model a set of conditions under which it is gradually improving the accuracy of its prediction and extending the range of effects that can be predicted. This self-improvement process occurs when changes in policies are introduced on somewhat hypothetical grounds and their effects are observed on a set of economic indicators. Depending on the degree to which the elements of theory which led to the deduction of the policy change are confirmed or not, the theory itself may be altered and improved.

The scientific method, of course, calls for theory to be improved and expanded by the results of the application. The collaboration between economist and government administrators (in some cases the same individual) has led to the creation of a highly effective macro-model of economic experimentation. And one in which relevance to the real problems of the society is a prominent feature.

The process of self-correction has proceeded relatively rapidly to the point that the economist can distinguish the effects of 3½ per cent unemployment from those of 3¼ percent or 4 per cent. They know the impact of several approximations of such things as full employment on income distribution, rate of family formation and the proportion of families with two wage earners. Certainly there are large areas that are poorly understood. For example, an issue that stands between psychology and economics, the question of what conditions lead business men in general to want to invest or not as it effects the rate of economic growth. Nevertheless, one must be impressed with the historical fact that an incomplete and only partially accurate social science theory, i.e., economics, was pressed into service and has been progressively improved.

The self-correction process is dependent on the monitoring of various quantities such as the amount of investment, the rate of interest, the size of the labor force, and the relationship between income and consumption. Many of these quantities are obtained by sampling techniques which introduce statistical considerations. However, although probability enters the mathematics of the prediction in several ways, the net accuracy has, for many predictions, proven to be quite good.

Despite the fact that there is a practice of adjustment of economic policies and some evaluation of the effects of the adjustment on selected economic indicators, there is no substantial extension of the evaluation of economic policies to the appraisal of their effect on primary group function.

For example, when a new industry enters an economically underdeveloped area its effect on the money flow in that area may be assessed. If that industry happens to follow a policy of hiring primarily female workers or works more than one shift per day there may be effects of familial processes and other contexts in which face-to-face interaction contributes to the socialization of children or adults. It would seem that a class of social indicators comparable to the economic indicators would constitute a sound extension of the mode of evaluation of economically significant events. This line of reasoning would apply as well to changes in economic policy, and to the planning of introduction of new public programs and new industry.

Some conferees challenged the economic model on the grounds that the effects of policy changes and of new programs are more indeterminant than we might be led to believe. They argued, also, that such changes are introduced by a less rational process than one might expect, that attitudes and interests of administrators rather than exhaustive surveys of well-grounded rationales for change may be the true determinants. Finally, they argued that requirements for evaluation of programs or new policies are minimal both prior to the introduction of a program and in the follow-up assessment.

There may also be a temptation for the social scientist who is not an economist to fall back on an argument that economics is now at a sound theoretical or paradigmatic stage in its development as a science, while the other social sciences remain pre-theoretical and hence unready to be operationalized in a combination of social policies and social indicators. However, the history of economics again is informative. Keynesian economics has grown rapidly to be a general theory of economics of high acceptability, not because it was a precise theory when first used for public purposes, but rather because it was used for public purpose while still in its formative stages.

It behooves other social scientists to seek to introduce their ideas into practice in public policy under conditions in which the effects can be monitored on a continuing basis and to insure that the effects are progressively reinterpreted for the improvement of theory.

There is, after all, not much that is exotic about the interest rate, or how fast an object moves in physical space, even though the methods of making the determinations may become complicated. When a supply of such straight forward data is available a fundamental condition for theorizing is satisfied: an inductive base for theory revision or new theory is explicitly available in a useful form. Thus, the establishment of urban observatories to monitor the conditions of life could specify diagnostic information to be collected on a continuing, systematic basis. Such data is not now available for the assessment of familial processes, by socialization of individuals, or the effects of general economics and cultural trends upon them.

Some implications of the above perspectives are that we should expand the planning phase that leads to the selection of new policies or programs, that evaluation in advance of implementation should be carried on by simulation methods, by a critical review from varied perspectives, and by carefully instrumented and suitably prolonged pilot work and preliminary field evaluation.

Since economists have not extended their monitoring to include the necessary data on families and since other social scientists have not created continually existing monitoring systems of the kind that are needed and since other social scientists have not created analogous systems, we are left without a certainty that effects of economic policy changes or of changes in other agency policies on family stability will be a consideration in deciding whether to introduce the change.

Administrative Complexities

Conferees, both university-based scientists and agency personnel, frequently spoke of the administrative problems that plague complex programs. Problems such as fragmentation of services, incongruity of requirements between co-sponsoring agencies or even between sections of the same agency, undependable short term funding, lack of protocol with regard to co-sponsorship and joint decision-making, lack of effective and permanent structures for interdivisional coordination, lack of methods of utilizing recognition by local groups of failure at higher administrative levels, incongruence of personnel and business standards between co-sponsoring agencies are apt to be as familiar to the reader as they were to the conferees. These complexities have led to the failure of many programs that were excellent in design but seemed to fail in implementation.

Many conferees recognized that truly whole family efforts would be among the most complex that could be undertaken, and hence, among the most vulnerable. The writer's paper, in Volume II of this report, touches on this issue. In a discussion of these matters, one conferee recognized the problem with the following remark to the writer who was outlining concern about the adequacy of administrative support for family-centered programs, saying, "I sympathize with you. I think you are on something that ought to be tackled. A lot of people have bumped into the same difficulties and have turned away from them." Someone else asked why there were so few experimental or service programs concerning the whole family, and observed that their conspicuous absence made it seem important to determine what the obstacles were and try to remove them. A third conferee frankly stated that the cooperation is too troublesome to be worth the effort, and attributed the difficulty to the inadequacies of agency personnel generally. This last broad judgement, of course, suggests that the problem may be one of institutional structure rather than of personnel incompetencies. There remain serious administrative limitations however, which will jeopardize any whole family program. The history of the Parent and Child Centers individually as an agency program testify to this.

One task group's discussion of the administration of whole family efforts produced a unanimous sentiment that agency programs should pay attention to the entire family, for the sake of the family and for the sake of the program, and that the effort should coordinate actively with other participating agencies. They felt that a model set of principles and procedures for inter-agency coordination with regard to whole family programs could be drafted and would be valuable. There were expressions to the effect that the cost of whole family efforts might be high, at least until minimum adequate service models had evolved.

The same task group broached a range of specific ideas that might facilitate whole family efforts as follows:

> Single worker is needed to coordinate directly between the family and several collaborating agencies at the local level.
>
> Convenient and coordinated availability of social services is desirable.
>
> One stop service centers and voucher grant system similar to MEDICAID are promising.
>
> A joint case registry to avoid duplication of data operations and eligibility reviews may help.
>
> Directing of educational and social services into the home was favored.
>
> Parent involvement in program direction, research, evaluation, and constituency and advocacy functions were thought to be very important.

An interesting suggestion was that every major procedure in the relationship of an agency and the family allow some specifiable options and opportunities for cooperative planning between the family and the agency. There was strong sentiment that families should directly control the disposition of resources provided them in any program.

The members of the task group admired the work of the interagency consortium which negoiated Coordinated Community Child Care and the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (1968). They responded with favor to a description of the establishment of a regional non-profit corporation to coordinate programs of HEW, OEO, and the Labor Department.

They raised questions whether it would be possible to standardize grant request forms and to develop a central, standard clearing procedure for whole family proposals.

The group was informed by a conferee that a policy review council planned to recommend to the President that there be a White House Conference on the family.

Needless to say, the conferees broached the possibility of several procedures or structures at the federal level for cultivating whole-family research. The simpler ones included cataloging multiple goals held within whole family programs and developing appropriate cost/effectiveness standards, continuing inventory of whole family program models, survey of quantative modes suitable for simultaneous analysis of data on behaviors of all individual members and interactions of all possible combinations of individuals within the family. A National Institute of Family Living was suggested. Also suggested was a Family Program Review Board which would be independently funded, have its own personnel, but, which would be charged with an inspection and review function in regard to the whole-family efforts of any agency. It might also serve as a clearing house for receipt and referral of whole-family proposals. Finally, there were some who felt it was not unreasonable to consider the merits of writing into law a provision for an annual Presidential Report on the State of the Nation's Families.

Values

It goes without saying that values were discussed a great deal during the conference. Various perspectives were offered and are reported in a somewhat telegraphic style.

It was said that people want a family, even in the romantic image, unless it is not feasible, and that, there then may be a sour grapes reaction.

Family stability was frequently mentioned as a meaningful value to be sought in the determination of policy and in the development of programs. The emphasis on family stability was most frequently tied to the rearing of children. As one conferee stated, ". . . in our present society the alternatives to the family for rearing children are very few, and usually not as good as the family . . .". Furthermore, it was said, few families can afford to hire qualified surrogates.

If fundamental social change is sought, then the family approach is appropriate. The family is an important enough social phenomenon, with regard to socialization and its failure, to deserve some formal, explicit, and centralized concern. The vast majority of the population spend most of their daily time within the family situation, 75% of their time on the average. Young and old spend more. Whatever will shape the young will happen there. If we intervene on behalf of the ideal family function, we are supporting normal human relationships rather than pathology. The family is "the unit of last resort in society".

There were also strong feelings that family stability is often determined by social and economic forces over which the family has no control and by forces which, while controllable, are not known to the family as affecting their future. There is no audit or review to convey to the public what the effects of such forces may be. Sentiment was that socio-economic considerations should neither force family intactness nor force family instability. The same things might be said with regards to the effects of public policy and programs. The public should be informed, however, and supported in its collective and individual decision-making.

On the other hand, in the absence of adequate data, it was recognized that there is a danger of being sentimental about the nuclear family, and that we must redefine the family and family stability. The emphasis on the family and its welfare inspired a statement of reservations. For example, speaking now of the inverse variable, instability, it was argued that there may be an optimal, but as yet undetermined level of instability, to protect against perpetuating pathological symbioses. For example, it was said that we do not know what the optimal level of the divorce rate, as a social indicator, should be. It may be that a failure rate of 30%, roughly twice the middle class norm, is optimal. We were warned not to set ourselves against divorce naively. Spouses, as role actors, may change but the continuity of the institutional structure or function may be preserved or improved in the process.

The earning woman will participate more in major decisions. This challenges man's traditional role. Anything that will bring mothers together across class lines for occupational advancement will make a richer and more complicated political force for reorganizing in these matters.

The mother, as a person, is neglected. Professional attention tends to center around the child's needs and schedules. In redefining the role of mother, more professionalism in mothering and higher prestige should be assigned to the role. We must attempt to specify what good mothering is. Many mothers, even educated ones, don't know and are overwhelmed. We can and should make articulated and educated guesses about what is going on in the stages of a child's development.

The assumption that the matriarchal family or poor family is bad was questioned. Social disorganization is not as prominent a feature of the poor or the matriarchal family as was thought. In many respects these families represent orderly adaptations to their circumstances.

Even illegitimacy means different things at different class levels. It is reported more readily at some class levels, and is changing in incidence differentially by class. Direct effects on personality development by the knowledge of illegitimacy have not been sufficiently studies and may be entirely dependent on cultural context. Whether there is a legal father may not be and important factor. It may be important that the role functions typically performed by a father are accomplished in the socialization of the child, but not whether there is a legal father. In some cultures, avunculates, some such functions are assigned to the mother's brother.

A rigid or stereotypic definition of the family, especially one that remains implicit, was criticized as inviting self-fulfillment by virtue of biased policies and procedures. Such a definition was held to prevent agency personnel from seeing what is, or may be. It prejudices them to see only what the stereotype dictates and to work toward its confirmation.

In sum, we were told that the family may be of central importance and by implication, that socialization certainly is. We were warned not to be ethnocentric in our concern for family structure, but to be aware, instead, primarily of family function. We were asked to be pragmatic in decision-making, and flexible in conceptualization. A great need for studies which would produce data in a form that would help with our policy-making was recognized.

Although the two main perspectives outlined above, capture the most frequent expressions concerning values, there was a third theme which requires special mention. It was frequently observed that legal issues, and even constitutional issues, are involved. The conferees did not divert into major discussions of such issues. They recognized that the outstanding questions must be resolved but offered no judgements as to how to proceed. In the end, however, it was clear that these matters call for formal exploration as a subordinate matter, even if not in their own right.

Comparison With Other Units For the Study of Social Problems

The conference did not produce the strong consensus concerning the merits of the family as the prime unit of study in social problems that was expected by the writer. It did not reveal a clear judgement that there is a readiness, much less an urgency, for a family-centered approach in preference to those approaches centered on the individual child or adult, the neighborhood, the community, or the national socioeconomic structure.

The conference did, however, produce a considerable interest in the possibility that the family as a unit in the study of social problems should be investigated rather systematically over the next few years. It is conceivable that a number of agencies and other policy-related organizations within and without government could and should each make preliminary decisions about such a direction of exploration.

Relevance to Education

American educational policy at the national, state, and local levels have often been tied to broad issues in the history of the community at each level. For example, science education is emphasized when we find our progress in physical technology lagging. As well, the school house may be the site of the town meeting and the instigator of concern for community problems.

Recently, education has found itself in an overly defensive posture. It is criticized by educators and by the public. Social problems which were formerly ignored by education, or, at least, seemed manageable, now threaten to overwhelm it.

In its effort to adapt, education has given up some of its isolation. There is more collaboration with other types of agencies. The content of education, particularly with regard to social development and social issues, is being revised. Ties with the community are being strengthened.

The effort to readapt education has engendered a search for new structure and content for education. The significance of the conference reported here would seem to be that the family, as a context of socialization, should be considered formally and explicitly as a possible focal point for educational innovation. Some step should be taken now to determine how and whether a family-oriented review or planning function should, within the educational establishment, or be conducted on an ongoing basis.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, N. W. The unity of the family. Archives of Pediatrics, 1938, 55.

Ackerman, N. W. The psychodynamics of family life. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Ackerman, N. W. & Kempster, S. W. Family therapy. In A. M. Freedman & H. I. Kaplan (Eds.). Comprehensive textbook of Psychiatry. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1967.

Ainsworth, M. D. The effects of maternal deprivation: a review of findings and controversy in the context of research strategy. In Deprivation of maternal care: a reassessment of effects. Geneva: World Health Organization, Public Health Papers, 1962, 14.

Ausubel, D. P. Learning theory and classroom practice. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1967, Bulletin 1.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart,& Winston, 1963.

Barker, R. G. & Wright, H. F. Midwest and its children. Evanston, Ill.: Row & Peterson, 1955.

Barker, R. G. Explorations in ecological psychology. American Psychologist, 1965, 20.

Bayley, N. Comparisons of mental and motor test scores for ages 1-15 months by sex, birth order, race, geographical location, and education of parents. Child Development, 1965, 36.

Baley, N. & Schaefer, E. S. Relationship between socio-economic variables and the behavior of mothers toward young children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1960, 96.

Bell, R. J. Structuring parent-child interaction situations for direct observation. Child Development, 1964, 35.

Bereiter, C. & Englemann, S. Teaching disadvantaged preschool children. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Berkowitz, L. The development of motives and values in the child. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Bernstein, B. Family role system, communication, and socialization. Paper read at the Conference on Development of Cross-National Research on the Education of Children and Adolescents. University of Chicago, February, 1964.

Blood, R. O. New approaches in family research: a symposium on the use of observational methods in family research. Marriage and Family Living, 1958, 20.

Bloom, B. S., Davis, A., & Hess, R. Compensatory education for cultural deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.

Bodin, A. M. Family interaction, coalition, disagreement, and compromise in problem, normal, and synthetic family triads. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28 (3-B).

Borke, H. The communication of intent: a systematic approach to the observation of family interaction. Human Relations, 1967, 20.

Bowlby, J., Ainsworth, M. D., Boston, M., & Rosenbluth, D. The effects of mother-child separation: a follow-up study. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1961, 29.

Briar, S. The family as an organization: an approach to family diagnosis and treatment. Social Service Review, 1964, 38.

Brookes, Holland (1922). Cited in H. T. Christensen. (Ed.). Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Burgess, M. E. Some implications of social change for dependency among lower-class families. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34.

Casler, L. Maternal deprivation: a critical review of the literature. Monograph of Social Research in Child Development, 1961, 26.

Chilman, C. S. Social work practice with very poor families: some implications and suggestions from research. Welfare in Review, 1966, 4 (January).

Christensen, H. T. (Ed.) Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Christensen, H. T. Development of the family field of study. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.). Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Christensen, H. T. Intrusion of values. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.). Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Colcord, J. Broken homes. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1920.

Cottrell, L. S. & Foote, N. New directions in research on the American family. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1953.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. The approval motive. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Dager, E. Z. Socialization and personality development in the child. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.). Handbook of marriage and the family. New York: Rand McNally, 1964.

Dave, R. H. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables that are related to educational achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, 1963.

Dinkmeyer, D. & Dreikurs, R. Encouraging children to learn: the encouragement process. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Donoviel, S. J. Responsiveness to maternal reinforcement in middle and low socio-economic children. Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27.

Drechsler, R. J. & Shapire, N. The procedure for direct observation of family interaction in a child guidance clinic. Psychiatry, 1961, 24.

Dunham, R. M. Ex post facto reconstruction of conditioning. In I. M. Cohen (Ed.). Psychiatric Research Reports of the American Psychiatric Association. Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 1966.

Dunham, R. M. Project Know How: A Comprenhensive and Innovative Attack on Individual Familial Poverty. A proposal to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Division of Research and Development, Tallahassee, Florida: The Florida State University, 1966 (mimeograph).

Durkin, D. Children who read early. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Duvall, E. Family development. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1957.

Duvall, E. M. & Hill, R. L. (co-chairmen). The report of the committee on dynamics of family interaction. Washington, D. C. National Conference on Family Life, 1948.

Elbert, S., Rosman, B., Minuchin, S., & Guerney, B. A method for the clinical study of family interaction. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34.

Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., Toigo, R., & Lefkowitz, M. M. Social class, parental punishment for aggression, and child aggression. Child Development, 1963, 34.

Fairweather, G. W. Methods for experimental social innovation. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Farina, A. & Dunham, R. M. Measurement of family relationships and their effects. Archives of Psychiatry, 1963, 9.

Federal Panel on Early Childhood. Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Fleck, S. The role of the family in psychiatry. In A. M. Freedman & H. I. Kaplan (Eds.). Comprehensive textbook of Psychiatry. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1967, 4.3.

Freeberg, N. E. & Payne, D. T. Parental influence on cognitive development in early childhood: a review. Child Development, 1967, 38.

Freeman, V. J., Klein, A. F., Riehmuln, L. et. al. Family group conseling, as differentiated from other family therapies. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1963, 13.

Freud, S. An outline of psychoanalysis. Translation by J. Strachey. New York: Norton, 1949.

Garmezy, N., et. al. The structured situational test: a method for studying family interaction in schizophrenia. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1960, 30.

Geismar, L. L. Longitudinal study: early identification of family disorganization. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14.

Geismar, L. L. The multi-problem family: significance of reasearch findings. Social Welfare Forum. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Geismar, L. L. & Ayres, B. Patterns of change in problem families: a study of the social functioning and movement of 150 families served by the family-centered project. St. Paul Family-Centered Project. Greater St. Paul Community Chest and Councils, 1959.

Dinkmeyer, D. & Dreikurs, R. *Encouraging children to learn: the encouragement process*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Donoviel, S. J. Responsiveness to maternal reinforcement in middle and low socio-economic children. *Dissertation Abstracts*, 1966, 27.

Drechsler, R. J. & Shapire, N. The procedure for direct observation of family interaction in a child guidance clinic. *Psychiatry*, 1961, 24.

Dunham, R. M. Ex post facto reconstruction of conditioning. In I. M. Cohen (Ed.). *Psychiatric Research Reports of the American Psychiatric Association*. Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 1966.

Dunham, R. M. Project Know How: A Comprenhensive and Innovative Attack on Individual Familial Poverty. A proposal to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Division of Research and Development, Tallahassee, Florida: The Florida State University, 1966 (mimeograph).

Durkin, D. *Children who read early*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Duvall, E. *Family development*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1957.

Duvall, E. M. & Hill, R. L. (co-chairmen). The report of the committee on dynamics of family interaction. Washington, D. C. National Conference on Family Life, 1948.

Elbert, S., Rosman, B., Minuchin, S., & Guerney, B. A method for the clinical study of family interaction. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 1964, 34.

Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., Toigo, R., & Lefkowitz, M. M. Social class, parental punishment for aggression, and child aggression. *Child Development*, 1963, 34.

Fairweather, G. W. Methods for experimental social innovation. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Farina, A. & Dunham, R. M. Measurement of family relationships and their effects. Archives of Psychiatry, 1963, 9.

Federal Panel on Early Childhood. Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

Fleck, S. The role of the family in psychiatry. In A. M. Freedman & H. I. Kaplan (Eds.). Comprehensive textbook of Psychiatry. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1967, 4.3.

Freeberg, N. E. & Payne, D. T. Parental influence on cognitive development in early childhood: a review. Child Development, 1967, 38.

Freeman, V. J., Klein, A. F., Riehmuln, L. et. al. Family group conseling, as differentiated from other family therapies. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1963, 13.

Freud, S. An outline of psychoanalysis. Translation by J. Strachey. New York: Norton, 1949.

Garmezy, N., et. al. The structured situational test: a method for studying family interaction in schizophrenia. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1960, 30.

Geismar, L. L. Longitudinal study: early identification of family disorganization. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14.

Geismar, L. L. The multi-problem family: significance of reasearch findings. Social Welfare Forum. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Geismar, L. L. & Ayres, B. Patterns of change in problem families: a study of the social functioning and movement of 150 families served by the family-centered project. St. Paul Family-Centered Project. Greater St. Paul Community Chest and Councils, 1959.

Geismar, L. L., La Sorte, M., & Ayres, B. Measuring family disorganization. Marriage and Family Living, 1962, 24.

Geismar, L. L. & La Sorte, M. Factors associated with family disorganization. Marriage and Family Living, 1963, 25.

Getzels, J. W. & Jackson, T. W. Creativity and intelligence. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1962.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. Predicting delinquincy and crime. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Goertzel, V. & Goertzel, M. G. Cradles of eminence. Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1962.

Gonberg, M. R. Family-oriented treatment of marital problems. Social Casework, 1956, 37.

Goodman, M. E. Race Awareness in young children. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1952.

Goodman, M. E. The individual and culture. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1966.

Gordon, I. J. & Lally, J. R. Early child stimulation through parent education. Research project of the Institute for Development of Human Learning. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1968.

Greenblatt, M. Role of community health worker. In Freedman, A. M. & Kaplan, H. I. (Eds.). Comprehensive textbook of Psychiatry. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1967.

Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. The Committee on Child Psychiatry of the GAP. Report #62, Vol. 6, 1966.

Haley, J. Family experiments: a new type of experimentation. Family Process, 1962, 1.

Handel, G. Psychology of whole families. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 63.

Hansen, D. A. & Hill, R. Families under stress. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.). Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964, 19.

Hellman, I. Sudden separation and its effect followed over twenty years: Hampstead nursery follow-up studies. Psychoanalytic Studies of the Child, 1962, 17.

Hess, R. D. & Shipman, V. C. Maternal influences upon early learning: the cognitive environments of urban preschool children. In R. D. Hess & R. M. Baer (Eds.). Early Education. Chicago: Aldine, 1968, 8.

Hess, R. D. & Shipman, V. C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36.

Hill, R. A critique of contemporary marriage and family research. Social Forces, 1955, 33.

Hill, R. Sociology of marriage and family behavior, 1945-56: a trend report and bibliography. Current Sociology, 1958, 7.

Hill, R. L. Methodological issues in family development research. Family Process, 1964, 3.

Hill, R. & Simpson, R. L. Marriage and family sociology, 1945-55. In H. L. Zetterberg (Ed.). Sociology in the United States. Paris: UNESCO, 1956.

Honig, A. S., Tannenbaum, J. & Cladwell, B. M. Maternal behavior in verbal report and in laboratory observation. Read at the American Psychological Association meeting. San Franscisco, California, Sept. 1, 1968.

Howe, H. C., II. A news summary of the war on poverty. Office of Economic Opportunity, August 12, 1968(a), Vol. III.

Howe, H. C., II, U. S. Commissioner of Education, HEW, The crisis of dissent. A talk presented before a meeting of Big City Boards of Education. Hotel America, Washington, D. C., June 17, 1968(b).

Hunt, J. McV. *Intelligence and experience*. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1961.

Jackson, P. W. Verbal solutions to parent-child problems. *Child Development*, 1956, 27.

Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, Inc. *Crisis in child mental health: challenge for the 1970's*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Kennedy, W. A. School phobia: rapid treatment of fifty cases. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 1965, 70.

Komarovsky, M. & Waller, W. Studies of the family. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1945, 50.

Laquerer, H. P., Laburt, & Morong. Multiple family therapy-further developments. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 1964, Ed. 2.

Leader, A. L. The role of intervention in family-group treatment. *Social casework*, 1964, 45.

Lidz, T., Fleck, S., & Cornelison, A. *Schizophrenia and the family*. New York: International Universities Press, 1966.

Maas. H. The long-term effects of early childhood separation and group care. *Vita Humana*, 1963, 6.

Marschak, M. A method for evaluating child parent interaction under controlled conditions. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1960, 97.

Mead, M. A. A cultural anthropologist's approach to maternal deprivation. Deprivation of maternal care: a reassessment of its effects. Geneva: World Health Organization, Public Health Papers, 1962, 14.

Monahan, T. P. Family status and the delinquent child: a reappraisal and some new findings. Social Forces, 1957, 35.

Moore, M. R. Consistency of interaction in normal and clinic families. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 27, 12-13.

Mowrer, O. H. A stimulus-response analysis of anxiety and its role as a reinforcing agent. Psychology Review, 1939, 26.

Myers, J. K. & Roberts, B. H. Family and class dynamics in mental illness. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1959.

Patterson (1924). Cited in M. Komarovsky & W. Waller. Studies of the family. American Journal of Sociology, 1945, 50.

Provence, S. & Lipton, R. Infants in institutions. New York: International Universities Press, 1962.

Radin, N. & Glasser, P. The use of parental attitude questionnaires with culturally disadvantaged families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 3 (August).

Rheingold, H. L. The measurement of maternal care. Child Development, 1960, 31.

Richmond & Hall (1925). Cited in M. Komarovsky & W. Waller. Studies of the family. American Journal of Sociology, 1945, 50.

Roe, A. & Siegelman, M. A parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 1963, 34.

Rosen, B. C. & D'Andrade, R. The psychosocial origins of achievement motivation. Sociometry, 22, 3, Sept. 1959.

Samenfink, J. A. & Kranzler, R. Goals and techniques of a family-centered laboratory nursery school. Journal of Home Economics, 52, 4, April 1960.

Scherz, F. H. Exploring the use of family interviews in diagnosis. Social Casework, 1964, 45.

Schulman, R. E., Shoemaker, D. J., & Moelis, I. Laboratory measurement of parental behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26.

Sears, R. R. A theoretical framework for personality and social behavior. American Psychologist, 1951, 6.

Sears, R. R. Identification as a form of behavioral development. In D. B. Harris (Ed.). The concept of development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957.

Spielberger, C. D. (ed.). Anxiety and behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1966.

Straus, M. A. Measuring families. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.). Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Stringer, L. A. & Pittman, D. J. The unmeasured residual in current research in parental attitudes and child behavior. In J. C. Glidewell (Ed.). Parental attitudes and child behavior. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.

Strodtbeck, F. L. Family interaction, values and achievement. In D. McClelland, A. Baldwin, U. Bronfenbrenner, & F. L. Strodtbeck. Talent and society. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958.

Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.

Sussman, M. B. Experimental research. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.). Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Terman, L. Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

Terrill, J. M. & Terrill, R. C. A method for studying family communication. Family Process, 1965, 4.

Torrance, E. P. Rewarding creative behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Vandenberg, G. H. Patterns of conflict and dominance in family interaction. Dissertation Abstracts, 1966, 27.

Vidich, A. J. Methodological problems in the observation of husband-wife interaction. Marriage and Family Living, 1956, 18.

Voiland, A. L. Family casework diagnosis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Webster, R. L. Infant language development project. Department of Psychology, Hollins College, Virginia, 1968.

Whiting, J. W. & Child, I. L. Child training and personality. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Wolf, R. M. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables related to intelligence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, 1964.

Wynne, L. C., Ryckoff, I. M., Day, J., & Hirsch, S. I. Pseudo-mutuality in the family relations of schizophrenics. Psychiatry, 1958, 21.

Yarrow, L. J. Dimensions of early maternal care. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9.

Yarrow, L. J. Maternal deprivation, towards an empirical and conceptual re-evaluation. Psychological Bulletin, 1961, 58.

Yarrow, L. J. Separation from parents during early childhood. In M. & L. Hoffman (Eds.). Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage, 1964, 1.